



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/600,955	06/20/2003	Apurva Dolatrai Naik	STL11224 9494	
75	590 07/26/2005		EXAM	INER
David K. Lucente			SNIEZEK, ANDREW L	
Seagate Techno	ology LLC			
Intellectual Property - COL2LGL			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
389 Disc Drive			2651	
Longmont, CO 80503			DATE MAILED: 07/26/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/600,955	NAIK, APURVA DOLATRAI			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Andrew L. Sniezek	2651			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	86(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed rs will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 Ju	ne 2003.				
	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	r.				
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>20 June 2003</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcting 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachmont/ol					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate			
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/20/03.	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/600,955 Page 2

Art Unit: 2651

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed 6/20/03 has been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim2, the phrase "may be" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention.

Examiner suggests to replace the phrase "may be" with - - is - -. to clarify this feature.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 4. Claim 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kovinskaya et al.

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application.

Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome

either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Kovinskaya et al. teaches an apparatus and corresponding method of operation that generates a reference velocity to control a moveable arm (see velocity curve (V)) and figure 1 which based on the distance between a present location and desired location a derivative of the velocity, i.e. an acceleration to vary linearly with respect to time, see acceleration curves. With respect to claim 2, the profile of the velocity curve (V) as depicted is deemed to satisfy the claimed function. Re claim 3: the second function is deemed satisfied by the position derivative function as describes in column 4, lines 59-67. Apparatus claims 4-6 are drawn to the apparatus corresponding to the method of using same as claimed in claims 1-3. Therefore apparatus claims 4-6 correspond to method claims 1-3 and are rejected for the same reasons of anticipation as used above. The claimed motor as set forth in claim 7 is satisfied by the actuator motor arrangement including coil (114) depicted in figure 1. The claimed medium of claim 8 id taught by element (108) which as seen in figure 1 moves with respect to the moveable assembly. The limitations of claim 9 are satisfied by combination of elements (126 and 128). The claimed transducer set forth in claim 10 is satisfied by element (112). Due the pivot point of the actuator as shown in figure 1 the head moves in a linear manner as set forth in claim 11.

5. Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brittner.

Art Unit: 2651

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131. Brittner teaches an apparatus and corresponding method as described in column 9 that determines a head velocity, compares the current velocity with the reference velocity. which is then scaled and combined with a deceleration signal that generates a command signal that is used to move the actuator. The deceleration signal is deemed equivalent to the claimed acceleration signal since both are based on at the change in velocity. Also, an acceleration signal can be inherently found by the derivative of the velocity signal. As broadly as set forth the limitations of claim 12 are deemed satisfied by this teaching. The claimed current velocity, position and acceleration of the arm as set forth is also, deemed satisfied by the teaching as discussed in column 9 of Brittner.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ding et al., Supino et al. and Andrews, Jr. Et al. are cited as teaching related seeking arrangements.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew L. Sniezek whose telephone number is 571-272-7563. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri..

Art Unit: 2651

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on 571-272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Andrew L. Sniezek Primary Examiner Art Unit 2651 Page 5

A.L.S. 7/22/05